

## **REMARKS**

Claims 1, 11, 14, 20, 29, 32, 33 and 36 have been amended. Support can be found at pages 2 and 4 of the Specification. Claims 1-36 are currently pending and under consideration. Reconsideration is respectfully requested.

### **I. THE SPECIFICATION:**

As mentioned above, claim 11 has been amended to recite "external memory". As indicated by the Examiner at page 3 of the Office Action, support for this amendment can be found at FIG. 1. Withdrawal of the objection to the specification is respectfully requested.

### **II. REJECTION OF CLAIMS 11-17 AND 19 UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 112, FIRST PARAGRAPH:**

The comments mentioned in section I above, may be applied here. Therefore, withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

### **III. REJECTION OF CLAIMS 14-17 AND 29-35 UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 112, SECOND PARAGRAPH:**

The comments mentioned in section I above, may be applied here. Therefore, withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

### **IV. REJECTIONS UNDER CLAIMS 1-36 UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 103(a):**

At page 6 of the Office Action, the Examiner asserts that element 150 in FIG. 31 of Taguchi is comparable to the Applicants' "internal circuit", and that element 155 is comparable to the Applicants' "internal memory" recited in claim 1.

Instead, element 150 is merely a protective enclosure which houses a data processing means, distributed software decryption means, encryption means, decryption means, key supply means, algorithm supply means and encryption method selection means for data security purposes (see column 25, lines 49-60). Encrypted data and a decryption key are supplied over the network to a user. In order to load the encrypted data for execution, the decryption key encrypted by a public key is sent to the distributed software decryption means. The decrypted data is forwarded to the encryption means and the key selection means selects an encryption

key group corresponding to the storage destination page number of the data and the selected encrypting key group is fed from the key supply means 155.

Further, Taguchi fails to disclose “an internal circuit including...a bus line connecting said CPU to said internal device, extending externally and transferring an address and data” as recited in claim 1. That is, the bus line 160 in FIG. 31 is not included in the protective enclosure, element 150, and the key supply means 155 and the data processing means 151 are not connected via the bus line 160.

At page 6 of the Office Action, the Examiner admits that Taguchi fails to disclose “ciphering of the address” as recited in claim 1. However, the Examiner asserts that Curran discloses this feature at column 1, paragraph 5 – column 2, paragraph 1; and column 3, paragraph 3).

Curran fails to make up for the deficiencies of Taguchi mentioned above. Further, Curran fails to disclose “an external circuit” as recited in claim 1.

Instead, at column 1, paragraph 5 Curran discloses a protection circuit including an encryption/decryption means coupled between a central processor and a memory means, and selectively operable for encrypting/decrypting program information stored in the memory means. The protection circuit of Curran is utilized to inhibit unauthorized copying of computer software such as an electronic video game (see Abstract). Further, although the protection circuit of Curran discloses address and data buses (at column 4, lines 25-27). As mentioned above, Curran fails to disclose “an external circuit”, therefore, Curran fails to disclose “ciphering the address and the data on the bus line by ciphering patterns according to...entirety of said at least one external device”, as recited in claim 1.

Further, the combination of Taguchi and Curran fails to disclose “prevent[ing] illicit access to the internal memory via the external memory”, as recited in claim 1. Thus, the combination of Taguchi and Curran fails to establish a prima facie case of obviousness over the present invention.

The dependent claims 2-3, 6-10, 18, 20-22 and 25-35 are also rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a). However, the dependent claims also include patentably distinguishing limitations of their own. For example, claim 2 recites “the ciphering patterns adopted by said ciphering section include one ciphering pattern which neither the address nor the data is ciphered”. As pointed out by the Examiner at page 7 of the Office Action, Taguchi discloses where only part of the data is encrypted (see column 18, paragraph 2). Therefore, Taguchi fails to disclose a ciphering pattern where neither the address nor the data is ciphered.

Although the above comments are specifically directed to claim 1, it is respectfully submitted that the comments would be helpful in understanding differences of various other rejected claims over the cited references. Therefore, it is respectfully submitted that the rejection is overcome.

**V. CONCLUSION:**

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, it is respectfully submitted that each of the claims patentably distinguishes over the prior art, and therefore, defines allowable subject matter. A prompt and favorable reconsideration of the rejection along with an indication of allowability of all pending claims are therefore respectfully requested.

If there are any additional fees associated with filing of this Amendment, please charge the same to our Deposit Account No. 19-3935.

Respectfully submitted,

STAAS & HALSEY LLP

Date:

August 22, 2005

By:

Deidre M. Davis  
Deidre M. Davis  
Registration No. 52,797

1201 New York Ave, N.W., Suite 700  
Washington, D.C. 20005  
Telephone: (202) 434-1500  
Facsimile: (202) 434-1501